



COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

## Examining the Practice Doctorate: A Timeline

Date	Activities
2010-11	<p>DSW Task Force report            The Doctorate in Social Work (DSW) Degree: Emergence of a New Practice Doctorate            Report of the Task Force on the DSW Degree Convened by the Social Work Leadership Forum            Ike Adams – Chair, Commission on Accreditation            Phyllis Black – Marywood University            Mike Daley – President, Association of Baccalaureate Program Directors            Donna DeAngelis – Executive Director, Association of Social Work Boards            Alan Dettlaff – Chair, Commission on Educational Policy            Richard “Dick” Edwards – Dean, University of Pennsylvania            Mit Joyner – President, Council on Social Work Education            Amanda Randall – President, Association of Social Work Boards            Barbara Rittner – Chair, Group for the Advancement of Doctoral Education            Julia Watkins – Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education            CSWE Staff            Judith Bremner – Director of Accreditation            Jessica Holmes – Associate Director for Research            Joyce White – Accreditation Specialist</p>
November 2012	<p>GADE partner session at APM:            Bentley, K.J., Rittner, B. &amp; Anastas, J. <i>Dialogue on the DSW: A GADE-sponsored conversation.</i> Panel presentation at the Annual Program meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Washington, D.C.</p>
December 2012	<p>Leadership Roundtable discussion (LR includes AASWSW, ASWB, BPD, CSWE, GADE, NADD, SSWR, St. Louis Group)</p>
September 2013	<p>NASW Social Policy Institute Think Tank: <i>Advanced Practice Doctorates: What do they Mean for Social Work Practice, Research, and Education?</i> See report at <a href="http://www.socialworkpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/SWPI_DSW_FINAL_Report.pdf">http://www.socialworkpolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/SWPI_DSW_FINAL_Report.pdf</a></p>
October 2013	<p>CSWE BOD creates a committee to explore the factors involved in accrediting a professional doctorate in social work.  <i>“As the sole accrediting body for professional social work education, what is the appropriate role for the CSWE Commission on Accreditation to have with the professional doctorates in social work?”</i></p> <p>The committee is asked to develop a plan to explore all relevant questions including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is involved in expanding the scope of recognition by CHEA?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the appropriate infrastructure to accredit a higher level of professional degree?</li> <li>• What other relevant logistical issues need to be considered by CSWE?</li> <li>• What is the impact of accrediting, or not accrediting, the professional social work doctorate?</li> </ul> <p>Members of the committee include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alan Dettlaff, Associate Professor, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chair, CSWE Commission on Educational Policy (COEP)</li> <li>• James Lubben, Professor and Program Director, PhD in Social Welfare, Boston College</li> <li>• Anna McPhatter, Dean, Morgan State University, Current Member of the Commission on Accreditation (COA)</li> <li>• David Patterson, Professor and Director, Clinical Doctorate Program, University of Tennessee at Knoxville</li> <li>• Christopher Petr, Professor and PhD Program Director, University of Kansas</li> <li>• Jo Ann Regan, Director, CSWE Office of Social Work Accreditation, Chair of the Committee</li> </ul> <p>CSWE Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorothy Kagehiro, Research Associate, CSWE Office of Social Work Education and Research</li> <li>• Adrienne Stokes, Research Assistant, CSWE Office of Social Work Education and Research</li> </ul>
October 2014	<p>DSW Committee presented to CSWE BOD the following recommendation (which was unanimously approved):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Survey current CSWE accredited programs to determine current and possible future advanced practice doctoral programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add items to 2014 Annual Survey, MSW Program section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Is your institution planning to offer an advanced practice doctorate degree in social work?” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. We already offer such a degree</li> <li>ii. Yes, in the next academic year.</li> <li>iii. Yes, within 2 academic years.</li> <li>iv. No</li> </ol> </li> <li>• “What type of advanced practice doctorate is offered or planned to be offered?--clinical, teaching, administrative, other?”</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Follow-up interviews with these programs and key informants (deans, program directors, graduates, and current students) at the current or planned (non-PhD) advanced practice doctorate programs in the United States to determine interest in seeking accreditation and perception of advantages/disadvantages and utility of seeking accreditation for advanced practice doctoral programs.</li> </ol>
December 2014	<p>Added items to 2014 Annual Survey of Social Work Programs (MSW section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Is your institution planning to offer an advanced practice doctorate degree in social work?” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. We already offer such a degree</li> <li>vi. Yes, in the next academic year.</li> <li>vii. Yes, within 2 academic years.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

	<p>viii. No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “What type of advanced practice doctorate is offered or planned to be offered?--clinical, teaching, administrative, other?”</li> </ul>																
<p>April 2015</p>	<p>Analyzed results</p> <p>Is your institution planning to offer an applied social work doctoral degree (i.e., other than PhD)?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="396 359 1321 638"> <tr> <td>i. We already offer such a degree</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ii. Yes, in the next academic year.</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iii. Yes, within 2 academic years.</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </table> <p>What type of advanced practice doctorate is offered or planned to be offered?--clinical, teaching, administrative, other?”</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="396 758 1321 921"> <tr> <td>i. Clinical</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ii. Teaching</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iii. Administrative</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>iv. Other</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </table>	i. We already offer such a degree	6	ii. Yes, in the next academic year.	3	iii. Yes, within 2 academic years.	12	TOTAL	21	i. Clinical	12	ii. Teaching	2	iii. Administrative	1	iv. Other	5
i. We already offer such a degree	6																
ii. Yes, in the next academic year.	3																
iii. Yes, within 2 academic years.	12																
TOTAL	21																
i. Clinical	12																
ii. Teaching	2																
iii. Administrative	1																
iv. Other	5																
<p>May-June 2014</p>	<p>Completed follow-up survey with current and planned advanced practice doctoral programs to determine interest in seeking accreditation and perception of advantages/disadvantages and utility of accreditation for advanced practice doctoral programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey invitations were sent to 19 contacts for advanced practice doctoral programs on August 19, 2015, through an internet-based survey administration platform. The survey closed on September 14, 2015. Eleven (64.7%) programs participated out of 17 successfully delivered invitations.</li> </ul> <p>Survey results indicate mixed interest in seeking accreditation and varied perceptions on the advantages/disadvantages and utility of accreditation for advanced practice doctoral programs.</p> <p>Detailed survey findings and the report to the Board are available at <a href="http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=83256">http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=83256</a></p>																

October 2015	<p>DSW Committee presented to CSWE BOD the following recommendation (which was unanimously approved):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Initiate a process like the process nursing employed to develop a report on the continuum of social work education that focuses on general content and differentiation amongst the social work degrees (associate, BSW, MSW, research focused PhD and advanced practice doctorates) with multiple groups/stakeholders besides the Commission on Educational Policy (COEP) and Commission on Accreditation (COA). See the nursing report at <a href="http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/DNPEssentials.pdf">http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/DNPEssentials.pdf</a></li> <li>•Identify what is the general curriculum content and educational outcomes of the advanced practice doctorate level with the involvement of multiple stakeholders (SSWR, GADE, BSW, MSW, PhD and DSW programs).</li> <li>•An appropriate structure would need to be created to conduct the above process that includes the multiple stakeholders identified. Nursing utilized a task force representing multiple constituencies in advanced nursing practice (see Appendix B in nursing report). The task force conducted multiple regional meetings to provide opportunities for feedback from a diverse group of stakeholders. Additionally, a national stakeholders’ conference was held with nursing education leaders and other professional organizations. Other stakeholders the committee discussed included social work organizations, employers, and graduates of DSW programs to gain a broader understanding of the role of the advanced practice doctorate to the social work profession.</li> </ul>
March 5, 2016	<p>Board President and DSW Committee Chair presented timeline of practice doctorate activities since 2010 to Board to see if any additional information was needed to move forward on the decision regarding accreditation of practice doctoral programs in social work. Since no additional information was needed, the Board voted to move forward with developing a process for the accreditation of advanced practice doctoral programs in social work.</p> <p>From Board minutes:  <u><i>Accreditation of Practice Doctoral Programs in Social Work</i></u>  <i>President Coffey presented an overview of the number of activities related to discussing and examining the issues of practice doctorates over the last ten (10) years (see attached timeline presented to Board on 3/5/16). A motion was made to The Board requesting that the Commission on Accreditation move forward with developing a process for the accreditation of practice doctoral programs consistent with existing CSWE processes. It was noted that the process will need to be done in a quality way and will need support and staffing to move forward with the implementation process. Dr. Coffey concluded her update, whereupon motion duly made. The motion was seconded and accepted. (Unanimous)</i></p>
June 2016	<p>COA meets to discuss board decision and decides to convene an end of summer face-to-face meeting with the Advanced Practice Doctorate Committee members, COA and COEP Chair, GADE President and other stakeholders identified to discuss and develop recommendations for process and timeline for the accreditation of advanced practice doctoral programs. Other accreditors will also be invited to discuss their process and timeline.</p>
August 2016	<p>Practice Doctorate Stakeholder Meeting at CSWE (See Appendix B)</p>

Jan 2017	Practice Doctorate Sub-Committee of COA & COEP met to develop timeline and framework outline
April 2017	Practice Doctorate Sub-Committee of COA & COEP met to finalize timeline and framework outline
Oct-Dec 2017	Practice Doctorate framework document released for feedback and comment at APM and feedback website
Jan 2018	Practice Doctorate Sub-Committee of COA & COEP met to develop draft 2 of framework
Feb-April 2018	Framework document presented to BPD and GADE for review and feedback
June 2018	Practice Doctorate Committee of COA & COEP Representatives and DSW program directors review framework document and develop draft 1 of accreditation standards
October-Dec 2018	Draft 1 of accreditation standards released for public review and comment via website and presented at APM
Jan 2019	Practice doctorate committee reviews feedback and develops Draft 2 of accreditation standards and process recommendations for COA to review
Feb 2019	Draft 2 standards presented to COA for feedback. Feedback summarized and sent back to COA for review and comment. Feedback will be shared with committee.

# Appendix B

## Practice Doctorate Stakeholder Meeting

Wednesday-Thursday, August 10-11, 2016  
CSWE Office, Alexandria, VA

### Attendees

Jo Ann Regan (CSWE Division of Education), chair of Practice Doctorate Committee  
Beverly Black (University of Texas-Arlington), COA representative  
Karen Dale (AmeriHealth Caritas, District of Columbia), employer representative  
Lina Hartocollis (University of Pennsylvania), program representative  
Dwight Hymans (Association of Social Work Boards)  
Liz Lightfoot (University of Minnesota), GADE President  
Peter Maramaldi (Simmons College)  
Debra McPhee (Fordham University) (via phone), COEP chair  
David Patterson (University of Tennessee-Knoxville)  
Karen Rice (Millersville University), NADD representative  
Andrew Safyer (Adelphi University), COA chair  
Joan Zlotnik (National Association of Social Workers Foundation), NASW representative  
Stacey Borasky (CSWE Department of Social Work Accreditation)  
Geraldine Meeks (CSWE Minority Fellowship Program)  
Dorothy Kagehiro (CSWE Department of Educational Initiatives & Research)

The focus of the meeting was to:

1. Develop an understanding of the process other disciplines have used for accrediting their practice doctoral programs and issues to consider in the development of the process and standards, and
2. Develop a set of recommendations for the Commission on Educational Policy (COEP) and the Commission on Accreditation (COA) regarding the development of a process and standards for the accreditation of practice doctoral programs.

See Appendix A for meeting agenda.

### Wednesday Session

The first day's session offered a review of the history and activities that led to the CSWE Board of Directors' decision to move forward with the accreditation of practice doctoral social work programs by Darla Spence Coffey, CSWE President and CEO. Andy Safyer, Chair of COA reviewed the group's charge.

Three guest presenters offered perspectives on accreditation of doctoral programs in other professions:

1. Kathy McGuinn, AACN Director of Special Projects, presented a history of the accreditation process for the Doctorate of Nursing Practice by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing and Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education.

2. Lori Schroeder, CCNE Director of Accreditation Services, reviewed the accreditation process and standards of the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education.
3. Loretta Nunez, Director of Academic Affairs and Research Education, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, gave a virtual presentation on the process for developing guidelines for the clinical doctorate in speech-language pathology.

### Comments at End of First Day

- Do a majority of DSW programs perceive themselves as advanced practice programs?
- There is some conflation of degree goals of PhD and DSW programs.
- We need to consider the issue of consumer/public protection.
  - Licensure provides some protection.
  - The requirement that applicants be graduates of accredited MSW programs also offers protection.
- What does a practice doctorate in social work convey to the public?
- Traditionally social work hasn't had a practice doctorate.
- What does "optional advanced practice doctorate" convey?
- Having "guidelines" (instead of standards) has resonance for some people.
- We didn't decide as a profession what a DSW is.
- This group's goal is to identify principles. Accreditation standards are farther down the road.
- We need to clarify the distinction between MSW, DSW, and PhD.
- The MSW as a terminal degree is in peril. We should protect the MSW while recognizing other degree options.
- The operative word is "practice," not "advanced." We are not trying to replace advanced training models.
- Accreditation affords protection against subpar minimal criteria.
- Accreditation affords protection against institutions that perceive practice doctoral programs as means to attract more tuition revenue.
- Resistance toward the notion of accreditation as a constraint against trying to address market needs was discussed.
- The Board's framework for our work is the DSW as "not a PhD, not a research-focused degree."

### Thursday Session

On the second day of the stakeholder meeting, participants were split into three different task groups to develop recommendations in three areas. See Appendix B for group recommendations regarding the three areas.

All three groups independently focused on the issue of quality in their topical assignments. All groups agreed that:

- a practice doctorate is distinguished from PhD programs by focus or emphasis (i.e., training to engage in practice grounded in established social work theories and empirical, evidence-based research), not by schism.
- Accreditation was perceived to assess a practice doctorate program's "value-added" – what and how does the program's training add to the professional value of applicants beyond what the applicants brought with them (e.g., training in an accredited MSW program and two years' post-master's practice experience)?
- Accreditation might also serve as a means of quality assurance for stakeholders such as potential employers, potential applicants, and the payers of their tuition, that the program can demonstrate to

an external reviewer (the accrediting body) that it can deliver what it claims in its mission statement (i.e., “truth in advertising”).

**Next Steps and considerations:**

1. The draft report will be internally reviewed by group members and then go to COA and COEP. There may be a joint work group that will work with stakeholders that will work on developing a timeline and next steps.
2. Can we offer a “timeline,” flowchart, or road map for the accreditation process?
3. Someone should attend the GADE conference in April to discuss the process and timeline.
4. We should consult student and faculty in current programs.
5. We should consider and plan what we say to current programs and how we say it.
6. What other stakeholders should we speak with?
7. We should articulate a rationale for DSW accreditation.
8. We need to continue to include and address disparate viewpoints regarding the accreditation of the practice doctorate in social work.

**AGENDA**  
**ACCREDITATION OF PRACTICE DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**  
**STAKEHOLDER MEETING**  
**AUGUST 10-11, 2016 MEETING AGENDA**  
**CSWE Office, 1701 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314**

The focus of the meeting is to:

- 1) develop an understanding of the process other disciplines have used for accrediting their practice doctoral programs and issues to consider in the development of the process and standards
- 2) develop a set of recommendations for the Commission on Educational Policy (COEP) and Commission on Accreditation (COA) regarding the development of a process and standards for the accreditation of practice doctoral programs

Practice Doctorate Committee Members:

- Jo Ann Regan, CSWE Vice President of Education, and Chair of the Practice Doctorate Committee
- Dorothy Kagehiro, Research Associate, CSWE Department of Education Initiatives and Research
- Beverly Black, Professor and PhD Program Director, University of Texas at Arlington, COA Representative
- David Patterson, Professor and Director, Clinical Doctorate Program, University of Tennessee at Knoxville
- Peter Maramaldi, Professor and PhD Program Director, Simmons College
- Not able to attend:
  - Alan Dettlaff, Dean, University of Houston Graduate College of Social Work
  - James Lubben, Professor and Program Director, PhD in Social Welfare, Boston College

COEP and COA Representatives:

- Andy Safyer, Dean, Adelphi University, COA Chair
- Debra McPhee, Dean, Fordham University, COEP Chair (by phone)
- Stacey Borasky, CSWE Director of Social Work Accreditation

Other Stakeholders recommended to participate in meeting:

- NADD representative-Karen Rice-DSW Co-Director, Millersville University
- GADE representative-Liz Lightfoot, GADE President, University of Minnesota
- NASW representative-Joan Levy Zlotnik, Social Work Policy Institute, National Association of Social Workers Foundation
- ASWB representative-Dwight Hymans, Executive Vice President, Association of Social Work Boards
- Employer representative-Karen M. Dale, Market President, AmeriHealth Caritas District of Columbia
- Program representative-Lina Hartocollis, Clinical DSW Program Director, University of Pennsylvania
- Minority Fellowship Program (MFP) (doctoral students) representative-Geraldine Meeks, Director, Minority Fellowship Program

**Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, August 10, 2016**

1:00 PM	<p>Welcome and Overview of Agenda Introductions</p> <p>Purpose and Outcome of Meeting</p>	<p><i>Jo Ann Regan, VP of Education, CSWE</i></p> <p><i>Andy Safyer, Chair, COA</i> <i>Stacey Borasky, Director of Accreditation, CSWE</i></p>
1:15-1:30 PM	<p>Brief update of history/activities leading to CSWE Board decision to move forward with accreditation of practice doctoral social work programs (see attached timeline)</p> <p>Discussion of COA Charge for Group</p>	<p><i>Darla Spence Coffey, CSWE President and CEO</i></p> <p><i>Andy Safyer</i></p>
1:30-2:30 PM	<p>Presentation by American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) and Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) on Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) Accreditation:</p> <p>Scope and Purpose of DNP, Development Process, and the <a href="#"><u>Essentials of Doctoral Education for Advanced Nursing Practice Nursing Essentials</u></a></p> <p><a href="#"><u>Accreditation Process</u></a> and <a href="#"><u>Standards</u></a></p>	<p><i>Kathy McGuinn MSN, RN, CPHQ</i> <i>AACN Director of Special Projects</i></p> <p><i>Lori Schroeder, MA</i> <i>Director of Accreditation Services, CCNE</i></p>
2:30-2:45 PM	<p><b>BREAK</b></p>	
2:45-3:30 PM	<p>Presentation by American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) on process for developing <a href="#"><u>guidelines for clinical doctorate in speech-language pathology</u></a></p>	<p><i>Loretta M. Nunez, M.A., AuD, CCC-A/SLP, FNAP</i> <i>Director of Academic Affairs &amp; Research Education</i> <i>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)</i></p>
3:30-3:45 PM	<p><b>BREAK</b></p>	
3:45-4:30 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion/feedback re: Accreditor presentations</li> <li>• Important issues/lessons from their experience to guide recommendations</li> </ul>	<p><i>All</i></p>
4:30-5:00 PM	<p>Task group assignments and plans for next day's work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task group 1: Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate and COEP Process Recommendations</li> <li>• Task Group 2: Accreditation Process Recommendations</li> <li>• Task Group 3: Accreditation Standard Recommendations</li> </ul>	<p><i>All</i></p>

## Meeting Agenda

**Thursday, August 11, 2016**

9:00-11:30 PM	<p>Work on Task Group Questions (see handout)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•<i>Task group 1: Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate and COEP Process Recommendations (Main Conference Room-Jo Ann)</i></li> <li>•<i>Task Group 2: Accreditation Process Recommendations (Room 201-Stacey)</i></li> <li>•<i>Task Group 3: Accreditation Standard Recommendations (Room 202-Andy)</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>Andy Safyer, Chair, COA</i>  <i>Jo Ann Regan, VP of Education, CSWE</i>  <i>Stacey Borasky, Director of Accreditation, CSWE</i></p>
11:30-11:45 PM	Check-In on task group status and pick-up box lunches	<i>Main Conference Room</i>
11:45-1:00 PM	Working Lunch: Discuss Recommendations from each Task Groups for report to COA and COEP	<i>All</i>
1:00-1:30 PM	Next Steps	<i>All</i>

### Task Group Members and Assigned Topics

**Group 1 Assignment: Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate and COEP Process Recommendations**

Members: Jo Ann Regan, CSWE, Debra McPhee, COEP (by phone), Joan Zlotnik, NASW, Dwight Hyman, ASWB, Lina Hartocolis, University of Pennsylvania (DSW program representative), Karen Dale (employer representative)

**Group 2 Assignment: Accreditation Process Recommendations**

Members: Stacey Borasky, CSWE, Beverly Black, COA, David Patterson, UT-Knoxville (program representative), Peter Maramaldi, Simmons College (PhD program representative)

**Group 3 Assignment: Accreditation Standards Recommendations**

Members: Andy Safyer, COA, Dorothy Kagehiro, CSWE, Karen Rice, NADD, Liz Lightfoot, GADE, Gerry Meeks, MFP

Task groups will meet briefly at the conclusion of the day on Wednesday, August 10 and work together all morning on August 11. Each group will bring forward to COEP and COA recommendations to consider for its assigned topic in relation to accreditation of practice doctoral programs. Jo Ann, Stacey and Andy will lead the groups that will report out discussion to larger group. Dorothy Kagehiro will record large group discussion and then compile a recommendations report based on large group discussion.

***Framing Questions for Task Groups (suggested but others may come up in discussion)***

**Task Group 1: Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate/COEP Process Recommendations**

1. What does the practice doctoral degree offer to social workers and employer/practice settings?
2. How do we clarify the scope and purpose of the practice doctorate that would be accredited?  
How do we define and differentiate levels of social work practice and their expectations and competencies across the social work education continuum- BSW, generalist MSW, specialized practice MSW, DSW and/or practice doctorate, PhD.
3. Should COEP conduct an environmental scan to ascertain the scope and purpose of the practice doctorate in today's practice arena? Should we involve employers?
4. How do we determine the impact of the accrediting practice doctoral programs on advanced practice credentials (BCD, NASW Credentials) and licensing?
5. Should all accredited programs have a standardized purpose and set of expected competencies for graduates? Is there core content that all accredited practice doctoral programs should have? How do we encourage innovation and creativity without being prescriptive?
6. Should competencies, quality guidelines/indicators and/or essentials be developed as was done in nursing for the accreditation of practice doctoral degrees? Why or why not?
7. Should graduates of practice doctorate programs have a level of expertise in at least one area of specialized practice?
8. Extending competencies of MSW?

**Task Group 2: Accreditation Process Recommendations**

1. Should the accreditation process be similar to that used for bachelors and master's degrees in social work? Why or why not? If not, how should it be different?
2. What issues should be considered when designing an accreditation process?
3. What timeframes would you suggest for candidacy periods and for programmatic reviews and why? How often should programs be reaccredited?
4. Who should be involved in programmatic reviews? Should the process be like outside program reviews done by universities?

**Task Group 3: Accreditation Standards Recommendations**

1. How do we encourage and support innovation and creativity in programs while considering guidelines and standards?
2. What are the key areas that should be included in accreditation standards for practice doctoral degree programs?
3. Should the standards be focused on outputs (what the program produces) or inputs (what goes into the program), or both? Provide some rationale for the recommendations.
4. Since these are practice degrees, what recommendations would you make regarding field/internship issues within the standards? (high-level ideas, such as broad experiences doctoral candidates should have; not specific things such as number of hours required)
5. What recommendations do you have regarding research requirements of a practice doctorate?

**Group 1: Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate and COEP Process Recommendations**

1. Need to understand what employers want from DSW graduates. Group discussed the following:
  - a. World view of skills (i.e., where is the profession going, how to meet the challenge of organizational change)
  - b. Knowledgeable about systems
  - c. Administrators who can practice
  - d. Knowledgeable about regulations and reimbursement
2. State licensing boards tend to look at a narrower scope (i.e., specialization) the higher the degree. Need to consider the impact on licensing with the accreditation of the practice doctorate.
3. Applied vs. clinical doctorate – would this lead to confusion of the public?
4. Broader view is better at this stage; accreditation is too prescriptive a term
5. Need to clarify degree outcome/product
6. How might scope of practice doctorate affect Medicare/Medicaid reimbursement?
7. Consider an accreditation approach that ties the purpose of the doctorate to program admission criteria.
8. Consider focusing on the intended degree outcome, like the approach taken by speech-language-hearing field.
9. Differentiate between research-focused and practice-focused doctoral programs without taking it to extremes; don't want to end up with practitioners who are not scholars or researchers who can't teach; but want to avoid perception of DSW as a diluted PhD
10. Consider doing more environmental scanning
  - a. Understanding the perspectives of current programs, prospective employers, doctoral students, regulators, state licensing boards, and sister organizations
  - b. Consulting peer reviews, literature reviews
11. Establish a clear set of guidelines first (e.g., Edwards paper)
12. Emphasis on quality assurance indicators
13. Consider program admission criteria of MSW from accredited program and two years' post-master's practice experience

**Large-group discussion addenda:**

- Slow down the process of moving toward accreditation in order to include all perspectives on the issue.

- Leave open whether accreditation is the inevitable outcome or only way of ensuring program quality.
- Does this framework apply to the entire domain of education (macro to micro)?
- The intended degree outcome is to prepare doctoral graduates for advanced practice roles: master practitioners, practice education, practice administration, leaders in practice settings/specializations, collaboration/support in practice research.
- See GADE website for a distinction between PhD and DSW: <http://www.gadephd.org/Prospective-Applicants/Why-a-PhD-or-DSW>

## Group 2: Accreditation Process Recommendations

1. Consider a different body or approach (from BSW and MSW accreditation process) to review practice doctorate programs.
    - a. Reviewers must include faculty from PhD and DSW programs.
    - b. Should include practitioners.
    - c. Consider excluding reviewers with only MSW as highest degree earned.
    - d. Reviewers should not limit their viewpoint to that taken in reviews of BSW or MSW programs.
  2. Consider whether or not to have a candidacy model.
    - a. Pro: Having a candidacy process provides consultative assistance to programs to meet quality criteria. If the aim is fostering such programs, then candidacy offers a low-stakes process.
    - b. Con: Don't need the same process map for DSW as we have in place for BSW and MSW. Having a candidacy process may result in too much oversight or coaching of programs by external reviewers (i.e., if the program's faculty do not already "get it," should the program be accredited?). Accreditation at the doctoral program level should be a high-stakes process.
  3. Gather additional information from doctoral program reviews from across the country (i.e., widen the search for data beyond just examples of accreditation reviews).
    - a. Program reviews afford a less cumbersome process but can still be rigorous and may be more focused.
    - b. Gather information about what site visits look like and who the site visitors are.
  4. Self-study and program review is needed as part of the accreditation process.
- Large-group discussion addenda
    - If an accredited MSW program decides to launch a DSW program, is it obligated to seek accreditation of the DSW programs? We discussed that it would not be a requirement as there are accredited MSW programs with BSW programs that are not accredited.
    - Accreditation is voluntary at all program levels.

### Group 3: Accreditation Standard Recommendations

1. The group began by reviewing the GADE guidelines and Edwards paper and selecting some of the important guidelines for standard recommendations.
2. Practice doctorate programs should present and explain:
  - a. Mission/vision and goals of the program, school, and institution
  - b. Explicit curriculum
    - i. How does the program's curriculum's design and delivery address its stated mission and goals?
    - ii. Is there a logical consistency between the curriculum and the program's mission and goals?
  - c. Learning context (implicit curriculum) or input
    - i. How the program contributes to the values/mission of the social work profession.
    - ii. Does the program have the resources to train students?
    - iii. Resources: faculty (size and qualifications), professional development funding for students and faculty, classroom/office space, administrative structure and support, library/technological support, mentoring
    - iv. What are the admission criteria for applicants?
  - d. What is the outcome produced by the program?
    - i. How does the program demonstrate its graduates have achieved what was stated in the program's mission and goals?
    - ii. Final capstone or product to demonstrate graduates' mastery
    - iii. Graduates' knowledge, skills, and abilities
    - iv. Aspirational outputs: publications, conference presentations, completion period
  - e. Assessment
    - i. Evaluation of output or final product
- Large-group discussion addenda
  - Would we require a program to have a practicum or internship as a means of demonstrating its graduates' mastery?
  - Is two years' post-master's practice experience sufficient without requiring a practice requirement by the programs?
  - We need the guidelines to be more specific and need to require the program to tie its outcome to advancing the social work profession. To tie the curriculum solely to the program's mission and goals invites a self-defined, self-fulfilling outcome.
  - We need outcomes that are measurable: program completion rate, employment of graduates or opportunities afforded to graduates
  - DSWs on licensing boards may choose independently to emphasize the need for a DSW for practice. What if board administrators begin to regard the DSW as the profession's terminal degree ahead of CSWE members' opinion?

# APPENDIX C

**ACCREDITATION OF PRACTICE DOCTORAL PROGRAMS  
COEP & COA PRACTICE DOCTORATE AD-HOC COMMITTEE MEETING  
April 26-27, 2017 MEETING AGENDA  
CSWE Office, 1701 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314**

The focus of the meeting is to:

1. review recommendations/discussions from COA, COEP, NADD and GADE meetings
2. review current practice doctoral programs based on 2016 annual survey results, website review and GADE report
3. develop the framework document to be released for review and public comment

COEP Representatives

- Debra McPhee, Dean, Fordham University, COEP Chair
- Larry Ortiz, Professor and Director, PhD Program in Social Policy and Social Research, Loma Linda University
- Bob Kersting, Social Work Department Chair, Westfield State University
- Chris Mitchell, University of Illinois at Chicago

COA Representatives:

- Andy Safyer, Dean, Adelphi University, COA Chair
- Beverly Black, Professor and PhD Program Director, University of Texas at Arlington
- Paul Maiden, Executive Vice Dean & Professor, USC Suzanne Dworak-Peck School of Social Work

CSWE Staff

- Jo Ann Regan, CSWE Vice President of Education
- Stacey Borasky, CSWE Director of Social Work Accreditation
- Katie Benson, CSWE Research Associate

**Meeting Agenda**  
**Wednesday, April 26, 2017**

8:30-8:45 AM	Welcome and Overview of Agenda Purpose and Outcome of Meeting	<i>Jo Ann Regan, VP of Education, CSWE</i>
8:45-9:30 AM	Feedback from COEP , COA, NADD and GADE Spring Meetings regarding framework and other issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are main issues framework document needs to address based on feedback from these groups?</li> </ul>	<i>Jo Ann Regan, VP of Education, CSWE Debra McPhee, COEP Chair Andy Safyer, COA Chair</i>
9:30-10:30 AM	Review of practice doctoral programs and curricula <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">GADE report</a>-see p. 4 and 87-95</li> <li>Handouts from website review and 2016 CSWE annual survey</li> <li>Summarize common elements</li> </ul>	<i>Katie Benson, CSWE Research Associate</i>
10:30-10:45 AM	BREAK	<i>All</i>
10:30-11:00 AM	Work plan to develop framework document Examples for review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="http://www.asha.org/policy/GL2015-00341/">http://www.asha.org/policy/GL2015-00341/</a></li> <li><a href="http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/DNPEssentials.pdf">http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/DNPEssentials.pdf</a></li> </ul>	<i>All</i>
11:00-12:00 PM	Work in small groups on framework document <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review all materials to date related to your assigned section (see Appendix A)</li> <li>Develop draft section for framework document to be reviewed by larger group</li> </ul>	<i>All</i>
12:00-1:00 PM	<b>LUNCH BREAK (lunch provided)</b>	<i>All</i>
1:00-4:00 PM	Continue work in small groups; finalize draft document for review by larger group	<i>All</i>
4:00 PM	WRAP-UP; Dinner on Own	<i>All</i>

**Thursday, April 27, 2017**

8:30-9:15 AM	Group 1 Review and Discussion	<i>All</i>
9:15-10:30 AM	Group 2 Review and Discussion	<i>All</i>
10:30-10:45 AM	BREAK	<i>All</i>
10:30-11:15 AM	Group 3 Review and Discussion	<i>All</i>
11:15-12:00 PM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Next Steps</li> <li>Plans for Feedback</li> </ul>	<i>All</i>

## **WORK GROUPS FOR FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT**

### **Framework for Accreditation of Practice Doctoral Programs**

The committee will also develop a framework for accreditation of practice doctoral programs prior to developing the accreditation process and standards. This framework will serve as the educational policy that will inform the development of the standards and process developed for the accreditation of practice doctoral programs in social work. The committee plans to develop a report that identifies the:

1. Definition and scope of practice doctorate in social work that will be accredited
2. Purpose of practice doctorate degree
3. Intended and unintended outcomes of practice doctoral program accreditation
4. Key features for practice doctorate accreditation standards
  - a. Quality indicators
  - b. Common elements/essentials of practice doctorate curricula

### **Group 1: Definition, Scope and Purpose of Practice Doctorate in social work that will be accredited**

*Bob, Chris, Jo Ann-staff (Large Conference Room)*

1. 2011 DSW Task Force Report (outlines focus and scope of the degree)
2. ASHA Scope <http://www.asha.org/policy/GL2015-00341/>  
<http://www.asha.org/policy/SP2016-00343/>
3. APA Scope <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/index.aspx>
4. DNP: <http://www.aacn.nche.edu/dnp/dnp-position-statement>  
<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/media-relations/fact-sheets/dnp>
5. Review August 2016 Stakeholder recommendations (Appendix B)
6. 2012 Anastas & Videka Article-(discusses purposes)
7. Bob Kersting Feedback

**Group 2: Intended and unintended outcomes of practice doctoral program accreditation**

*Debra, Larry, Katie-staff (Dean Pierce Conference Room)*

Documents for review:

1. <http://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/2012-Report-SLP-Clinical-Doctorate.pdf>
2. SWPI Report
3. Review August 2016 Stakeholder recommendations (Appendix B)

**Group 3: Key features for practice doctorate accreditation standards**

*Andy, Beverly, Paul, Stacey-staff (Other conference room)*

Documents for review:

1. Review August 2016 Stakeholder recommendations (Appendix B)
2. DNP Essentials <http://www.aacn.nche.edu/publications/position/DNPEssentials.pdf>
3. ASHA Guidelines <http://www.asha.org/policy/GL2015-00341/>
4. APA Standards <http://www.apa.org/ed/accreditation/about/policies/guiding-principles.pdf> (review domains)
5. 2011 DSW Task Force Report (outlines key elements)
6. 2012 Anastas & Videka Article-discusses key features
7. Bob Kersting feedback